

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated April 19, 2005.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of informalities. The disclosure has been amended in order to overcome the objection.

Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 6-8 and 10 have been amended and claim 9 has been canceled to overcome the rejection.

Moreover, the Examiner has rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gits, et al., USP2,931,119. Furthermore, the Examiner has suggested amendment to claim 6 to give patentable weight to claim 6. Claims 6-8 and 10 have been amended and claim 9 has been canceled to overcome the rejection.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the amended claims clearly and distinctly patentably define over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

July 19, 2005